

EXHIBIT 2

From: [Hannah Santasawatkul](#)
To: [Paige Amstutz](#); [Cole Richter](#)
Cc: [mark.waltfairpllc.com](#); [Sonos-WDTX0881-service](#); [QE-Sonos3](#); [Evan Pearson](#); [Robert Earle](#); [Jun Zheng](#)
Subject: RE: Sonos v. Google - 6:20-cv-00881-ADA - Urgent Request for Hearing on Venue Discovery Dispute
Date: Friday, July 16, 2021 2:10:10 PM

Good afternoon Counsel,

The Court has reviewed both Parties' responses and will maintain its rulings.

The Court is well aware that the issue of sur-reply was raised; however, still no motion for leave was filed with a deadline. Additionally, the Court reiterates that deadline for sur-reply is usually a week after the reply is filed. Knowing this, Sonos should not have waited to file a request for leave to file sur-reply that would inevitably extend beyond such a deadline and shorten the time that the Court would have to rule on the motion to transfer prior to the Markman hearing that has already been pushed back. The Court is aware of the interplay of the various issues and has prioritized resolving the Motion to Transfer prior to the Markman as evident from its Standing Order and various orders passed down from the Federal Circuit. If you would prefer, the Court is happy to push back the Markman by a couple months to allow you more time to file a sur-reply and for the Court to review the motion to transfer briefs in full before issuing an order. **The Court anticipates that if it were to reschedule the Markman the next available date would be early November**, as the Court will be out of town for several weeks in October. The Court is also amenable to issuing a stay pending resolution of the Motion to Transfer.

*Please meet-and-confer as to whether you would like the Court to extend the deadline for sur-reply and also push back the Markman to November or whether you would like the Court to extend the deadline and issue a stay pending resolution of the Motion to Transfer. Please notify the Court of your joint decision by COB Monday, July 19, 2021.

The Court's mention of discovery motions refers to the Motion to Compel that was mentioned in your joint chart submission.

Additionally, the Court's default schedule delineated in its OGP sets submission of JCCS at two weeks before Markman not a week before. Again, to allow the Court ample time to review the briefs and issue its preliminary claim constructions. The Court has adjusted your deadlines accordingly.

Please let me know if you have any other questions.

Best,
Hannah

From: Paige Amstutz <pamstutz@scottdoug.com>
Sent: Friday, July 16, 2021 12:43 PM
To: Cole Richter <richter@ls3ip.com>; Hannah Santasawatkul <Hannah_Santasawatkul@txwd.uscourts.gov>
Cc: mark.waltfairpllc.com <mark@waltfairpllc.com>; Sonos-WDTX0881-service <Sonos-WDTX0881-